arXiv:1404.1640v1 [math.AP] 7 Apr 2014

Indefinite fractional elliptic problem and Liouville theorems

Wenxiong Chen and Jiuyi Zhu

Abstract. In this paper, we consider the indefinite fractional elliptic problem. A corresponding Liouville-type theorem for the indefinite fractional elliptic equations is established. Furthermore, we obtain a priori bound for solutions in a bounded domain by blowing-up and re-scaling. We also classify the solutions of some degenerate elliptic equation originated from fractional Laplacian.

1. Introduction

The paper is to devote to studying the fractional Laplacian with indefinite nonlinearity:

$$\begin{cases} (-\triangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u = a(x)g(u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $0 < \alpha < 2$, Ω is a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $n > \alpha$. Concerning the function $a(x)$, we assume that $a(x) \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$,

$$\Omega^+ := \{x \in \Omega : a(x) > 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega^- := \{x \in \Omega : a(x) < 0\}$$

are nonempty, and that

$$\Gamma := \bar{\Omega}^+ \cap \bar{\Omega}^- \subset \Omega, \quad \text{with } \nabla a(x) \neq 0 \ \ \forall x \in \Gamma.$$

As for $g(u)$, it is a C^1 function on $\mathbb{R}^+$ with power-like growth at infinity

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{g(s)}{s^p} = l > 0 \quad \text{for some } p > 1. \tag{1.2}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $l = 1$. The model (1.1) with $\alpha = 2$ has been studied in [**BCN**], which is called the indefinite semilinear problem. Hence the case $0 < \alpha < 2$ we studied here could be considered as an indefinite fractional elliptic problem.

The fractional Laplacian has attracted much attention recently. It has applications in mathematical physics, biological modeling and mathematical finances and so on. Especially, it appears in turbulence and water wave, anomalous dynamics, flames propagation and chemical reactions in liquids, population dynamics, geophysical fluid dynamics, and American options in finance. It also has connections to conformal geometry, e.g. [**CG**].

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35B53, 35B45, 35J70,

Key words and phrases. fractional Laplacian, Indefinite problem, Liouville theorem.

.

The fractional Laplacian $(-\triangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is a nonlocal operator defined as

$$(-\triangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u = C_{n,\alpha}P.V.\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{u(x)-u(y)}{|x-y|^{n+\alpha}}\,dy,$$

where *P.V.* means in the cauchy principle value sense. Another equivalent definition is given by Fourier transform, that is,

$$\widehat{(-\triangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u}(\xi) = |\xi|^{\alpha}\hat{u}(\xi),$$

where $u(x)$ is in the Schwartz class of functions. Observe that the above definitions are nonlocal. Recently, Caffarelli and Silvestre in [**CS**] introduced a local realization of the fractional Laplacian $(-\triangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ through the Dirichlet-Neumann map of an appropriate degenerate elliptic operator in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$. Based on Caffarelli-Silvestre's extension, we are able to study the fractional Laplacian $(-\triangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ in a local way and to use the tools for semilinear elliptic equations. More precisely, if $u \in H^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then w is its extension in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$, if it solves the equation

$$\begin{aligned} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla w) = &\quad 0 && \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+,\\ w = &\quad u && \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n\times\{y=0\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is shown that in [**CS**] that

$$\lim_{y\to 0^+} y^{1-\alpha}\frac{\partial w}{\partial y}(x,y) = k_\alpha(-\triangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u(x),$$

where the constant

$$k_\alpha = \frac{2^{1-\alpha}\Gamma(1-\frac{1}{2}\alpha)}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2}\alpha)}.$$

To define the fractional Laplacian in a bounded domain, the idea is to use the Caffarelli-Silvestre's extension in a cylindrical domain. See [**CT**] for the case $\alpha = 1$ and [**BCDS**] for its generalization to $0<\alpha<2$. Let $\{\lambda_k,\phi_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ be the eigenvalues and corresponding eigenfunctions of the Laplacian operator $-\triangle$ in Ω with zero Dirichlet boundary values on $\partial\Omega$,

$$\begin{cases} -\triangle\phi_k = \lambda_k\phi_k & \text{in } \Omega,\\ \phi_k = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

such that $\|\phi_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 1$ and $0<\lambda_1<\lambda_2\le\lambda_3\le\cdots$. The fractional Sobolev space $H_0^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\Omega)$ is defined by

$$H_0^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\Omega) = \{u = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k\phi_k \in L^2(\Omega) : \|u\|_{H_0^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\Omega)} = (\sum a_k^2\lambda_k^{\frac{\alpha}{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}}\},$$

which is also a Hilbert space. Let

$$C_\Omega = \{(x,y) : x\in\Omega, y\in\mathbb{R}_+\}\subset\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$$

and $\partial_L C_\Omega := \partial\Omega \times (0,\ \infty)$ its lateral boundary. If we reformulate the nonlocal problem (1.1) by Caffarelli-Silvestre's extension, then it corresponds to

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla w) = & 0 & \text{in } C_\Omega, \\ w(x,y) = & 0 & \text{on } \partial_L C_\Omega, \\ w(x,0) = & u(x) & \text{on } \Omega\times\{0\}, \\ -\lim\limits_{y\to 0^+} y^{1-\alpha}\frac{\partial w}{\partial y} = & a(x)g(u) & \text{on } \Omega\times\{0\}. \end{cases}$$

The indefinite elliptic problem for Laplace operator

$$\begin{cases} -\triangle u = & a(x)u^p & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = & 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

has been extensively studied in the literature, where $a(x)$ satisfies the condition as above. See e.g. [**AL**], [**AT**], [**BCN**], [**BCN1**], [**DL**], [**Z**], just to mention a few. In order to prove the existence and multiplicity of positive solutions, it is very important to obtain a priori bound of solutions. Blow-up techniques of Gidas-Spruck [**GS**] and Liouville theorems are very useful in obtaining the a priori bound. Concerning problem (1.4), the maxima of a sequence of solutions may blow up on $\partial\Omega$, $\Omega^+\cup\Omega^-$ or Γ. If the blow-up occurs at $\partial\Omega$ or $\Omega^+\cup\Omega^-$, we can make use of the classical Liouville theorems in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ to get a contradiction and hence obtain a priori bound. If the blow-up occurs on Γ, Berestycki, Capuzzo-Docetta and Nirenberg in [**BCN**] were able to obtain the a priori bound by establishing a Liouville theorem for

$$\begin{cases} -\triangle u = x_1 u^p & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

It was shown that there exists no positive solution for $p < \frac{n+2}{n-1}$. Later Chen and Li [**CL**],[**CL1**] further relaxed the restriction on $a(x)$ near Γ and obtain a priori bound with a general $p > 1$. As we know, Liouville theorem is a key in obtaining a priori bound. There are also several Liouville theorems for indefinite elliptic problems. Lin [**Lin**] proved that the nonnegative solution for

$$-\triangle u = x_1^m u^{n^*} \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n$$

is trivial, when m is an odd positive integer and $n^* = \frac{n+2}{n-2}$ is the critical exponent of Sobolev imbedding. Du and Li [**DL**] considered nonnegative solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\triangle u = h(x_1)u^p & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \sup_{\mathbb{R}^n} < \infty & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

where $h(t) = t|t|^s$ or $h(t) = (t^+)^s$ for some $s > 0$ and $p > 1$. They showed the solution is trivial. Zhu [**Z1**] investigated the indefinite nonlinear boundary condition motivated by a prescribing sign-changing scalar curvature problem on compact Riemannian manifolds with boundary. He proved that there exists no solution for

$$\begin{cases} -\triangle u = & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_n} = & -x_1 u^p & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases}$$

If one considers the fractional indefinite problem (1.1) and applies the blow-up technique, one will also have to deal with the case that the blow-up occurs on Γ. Hence we

shall first establish a Berestycki, Capuzzo-Docetta and Nirenberg's type Liouville theorem for the fractional Laplacian. This is our first goal. We prove

THEOREM 1. *Let $1 \leq \alpha < 2$ and $w \in H^1_{loc}(y^{1-\alpha}, \overline{R^{n+1}_+})$. Then the degenerate elliptic equation*

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla w) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ -\lim\limits_{y\to 0^+} y^{1-\alpha}\frac{\partial w}{\partial y}(x,y) = x_1 w^p(x,0) & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ \end{cases} \tag{1.7}$$

has no positive bounded solution provided $1 < p < \infty$.

The weighted Sobolev space in a domain D in Theorem 1 is given by

$$H^1(y^{1-\alpha}, D) := \{u \in L^2(D, y^{1-\alpha}dxdy) : \ |\nabla u| \in L^2(D, y^{1-\alpha}dxdy)\}.$$

An immediate consequence of the theorem is the following.

COROLLARY 1. *Let $1 \leq \alpha < 2$ and u be nonnegative bounded solution of*

$$(-\triangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u = x_1 u^p \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{1.8}$$

Then $u \equiv 0$ if $1 < p < \infty$.

With aid of the Liouville theorem for (1.7), we are able to establish a universal L^∞ bound for every solution in (1.1).

THEOREM 2. *If $1 \leq \alpha < 2$ and $1 < p < \frac{n+\alpha}{n-\alpha}$, then there exists a universal positive constant C such that every solution in (1.1) satisfies*

$$\|u\|_\infty \leq C.$$

Due to the importance and powerful applications of Liouville theorems in elliptic problems, we further investigate the Liouville theorem for the equation

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla w) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ \lim\limits_{y\to 0^+} y^{1-\alpha}\frac{\partial w}{\partial y}(x,y) = w^p(x,0) & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+. \end{cases} \tag{1.9}$$

We are able to classify all the solutions.

THEOREM 3. *Let $w \in H^1_{loc}(y^{1-\alpha}, \overline{R^{n+1}_+})$ be a nonegative solution of (1.9), $0 < \alpha < 2$, and $p > 1$, then $w = \frac{ay^\alpha}{\alpha} + b$ where $b > 0$ and $a = b^p$.*

A similar result for the case of $\alpha = 1$ has been obtained in [**LZ**]. Equation (1.9) can be regarded as the Caffarelli-Silvestre's extension for

$$(-\triangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u = -u^p \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{1.10}$$

We know that there exist no nonnegative solution for (1.10). Interestingly, the solutions for (1.9) exist locally and we are able to classify all.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 1 is devoted to proving Liouville theorem for (1.7). We study the a priori bound for the fractional indefinite elliptic problem (1.1) in section 2. In section 3, we classify all the solutions in (1.9) and establish Theorem 3.

2. Liouville theorem for fractional indefinite problem

An efficient way to prove the Liouville theorem is to apply the moving plane method in appropriate settings. We show Theorem 1 by a contradiction argument and adapt the ideas in [**Z1**] and [**Lin**]. The case of $\alpha = 1$ is studied in [**Z1**] by the method of moving planes. However, for the general case $1 \leq \alpha < 2$, we have to introduce new and appropriate auxiliary functions and take the regularity of solutions into considerations. New ideas are introduced on selecting the auxiliary functions and more complicated calculations are involved.

Suppose that there is a nontrivial solution to (1.7). By the strong maximum principle in [**CaS**], we know that $w(x, y) > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$. For ease of notation, we define the operators

$$L_\alpha w := y^{\alpha-1} div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla w) = \triangle w + \frac{1-\alpha}{y}\frac{\partial w}{\partial y}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu^\alpha} := -\lim_{y\to 0^+} y^{1-\alpha}\frac{\partial w}{\partial y}.$$

Then problem (1.7) can be rewritten in the form:

$$\begin{cases} L_\alpha w = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = x_1 w^p & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

To employ the moving plane method, we set up some useful notation. Let

$$X = (x, y) = (x_1, \cdots, x_n, y).$$

For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$\Sigma_\lambda = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ | x_1 < \lambda\}$$

and

$$T_\lambda = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ | x_1 = \lambda\}.$$

The reflection of X with respect to T_λ is

$$X^\lambda = (2\lambda - x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n, y).$$

Set $w_\lambda(X) = w(X^\lambda)$. We compare the value of w and w_λ. Let

$$v_\lambda(X) = w_\lambda(X) - w(X).$$

We can verify that $v_\lambda(X)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} L_\alpha v_\lambda = 0 & \text{in } \Sigma_\lambda, \\ \frac{\partial v_\lambda}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = x_1^\lambda w_\lambda^p - x_1 w^p & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ \cap \overline{\Sigma_\lambda}. \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

We would like to show that $w(X)$ is monotone nondecreasing in x_1 direction. The goal is to prove the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 1. *For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $X \in \Sigma_\lambda$, $v_\lambda(X) \geq 0$ in Σ_λ.*

PROOF. We divide the proof in two major steps.

Step 1: For any $\lambda \leq 0$ and $X \in \Sigma_\lambda$, $v_\lambda(X) \geq 0$ in Σ_λ.

We select the test function

$$g(X) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} \ln[(2 - x_1)^2 + x_i^2] + \ln[(2 - x_1)^2 + y^2].$$

It is easy to see that

$$g(X) \to \infty \quad \text{as } |X| \to \infty.$$

We can also check that for $\lambda \leq 0$,

$$\triangle g(X) = 0, \quad g(X) > 0, \ \frac{\partial g}{\partial y} > 0 \ \text{ in } \Sigma_\lambda \quad \text{and} \ \ \frac{\partial g}{\partial y} = 0 \text{ on } \partial \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ \cap \overline{\Sigma_\lambda}. \tag{2.3}$$

Define

$$\bar{v}_\lambda(X) = \frac{v_\lambda(X)}{g(X)}.$$

Then $\bar{v}_\lambda$ satisfies the following equation

$$\begin{cases} L_\alpha \bar{v}_\lambda + 2\frac{\nabla g}{g} \cdot \nabla \bar{v}_\lambda + \frac{1-\alpha}{y}\frac{1}{g} \cdot \frac{\partial g}{\partial y} \cdot \bar{v}_\lambda = 0 & \text{in } \Sigma_\lambda, \\ \frac{\partial \bar{v}_\lambda}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = \frac{1}{g} \cdot (x_1^\lambda w_\lambda^p - x_1 w^p) & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ \cap \overline{\Sigma_\lambda}. \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

□

In the above equation, we have used the facts in (2.3). Since w is bounded, then $\bar{v}_\lambda(X) \to 0$ as $|X| \to \infty$. If $\bar{v}_\lambda(X) < 0$ at some point in Σ_λ, then $\bar{v}_\lambda(X^0) = \inf_{\Sigma_\lambda} \bar{v}_\lambda(X)$ must be attained in $\overline{\Sigma_\lambda}$. If $X^0 \in \Sigma_\lambda$, then

$$\triangle \bar{v}_\lambda(X^0) \geq 0, \quad \nabla \bar{v}_\lambda(X^0) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{v}_\lambda(X^0) < 0.$$

It contracts the first equation in (2.4) since $1 \leq \alpha < 2$. It is also impossible for $X^0 \in T_\lambda$. So $X^0 \in \partial \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ \cap \{x_1 < \lambda\}$, which implies that $\frac{\partial \bar{v}_\lambda}{\partial y}(X^0) \geq 0$. Hence

$$\frac{\partial \bar{v}_\lambda}{\partial \nu^\alpha} \leq 0.$$

However,

$$x_1^{0,\lambda} w_\lambda^p(X^0) - x_1^0 w^p(X^0) > x_1^0 (w_\lambda^p(X^0) - w^p(X^0)) > 0,$$

where $x_1^{0,\lambda}$ is the reflection of x_1^0 with respect to T_λ. Obviously a contradiction is arrived because of the second equation in (2.4). Therefore $\bar{v}_\lambda(X) \geq 0$ in Σ_λ for $\lambda \leq 0$, so is v_λ. We complete the first step.

We move the plane further to the right. Define

$$\lambda_0 = \sup\{\lambda : v_\lambda(X) \geq 0 \text{ in } \Sigma_\mu \text{ for } \mu \leq \lambda\}.$$

From the conclusion in step 1, we know that $\lambda_0 \geq 0$. We shall show that the plane can be moved all the way to the positive infinity, that is,

Step 2: $\lambda_0 = +\infty$.

We also prove it by contradiction. Suppose that $\lambda_0 < +\infty$. It is clear that $v_{\lambda_0}(X) \not\equiv 0$. By the maximum principle in [**CaS**], we infer that

$$v_{\lambda_0}(X) > 0 \quad \text{in } \Sigma_{\lambda_0} \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial v_{\lambda_0}}{\partial x_1}(X) < 0 \quad \text{for } X \in T_{\lambda_0} \cap \Sigma_{\lambda_0}.$$

In order to derive a contradiction in the future argument, a subtle analysis has to be given to the corner point $\hat{X} \in T_{\lambda_0} \cap \partial \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$. We are able to establish the following technical lemma to take care of $\hat{X}$. Our argument is inspired by lemma 2.4 in [**LYZ**]. Since we consider degenerate elliptic equations, more considerations have to be taken into

the choice of auxiliary function. After careful calculations, we are able to find the desired auxiliary function in fractional Laplacian setting.

LEMMA 1. *Assume that v_{λ_0} satisfies (2.2) and $v_{\lambda_0} > 0$ in Σ_{λ_0}. If $\hat{X} \in T_{\lambda_0} \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$, then*

$$\frac{\partial v_{\lambda_0}}{\partial x_1}(\hat{X}) < 0.$$

PROOF. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\lambda_0 = 1$ and $\hat{X} = (1, 0, \cdots, 0)$. Set

$$\hat{\Omega} := \{X : \mathbb{B}_1^+ \backslash \overline{\mathbb{B}^+_{\frac{1}{2}}},\ y \leq \frac{1}{5}\}.$$

Introduce the function

$$h(X) = \beta(|x|^{-\gamma} - 1)(y^\alpha + \mu),$$

where $\gamma > \max\{\frac{n+\alpha}{2},\ (n-2)\}$ and $\beta, \mu > 0$ will be determined later. The test function is given by

$$\psi(X) = h(X) - |X|^{\alpha-n} h(\frac{X}{|X|^2}).$$

Let

$$Z(X) = |X|^{\alpha-n} w(\xi),$$

where $\xi := \frac{X}{|X|^2}$.

A matter of calculus yields that

$$L_\alpha Z(X) = |X|^{\alpha-n-4} L_\alpha w(\xi). \tag{2.6}$$

Direct calculations also show that

$$L_\alpha h(X) = \beta\gamma(\gamma + 2 - n)|x|^{-\gamma-2}(y^\alpha + \mu).$$

It follows from (2.6) that

$$L_\alpha(|X|^{\alpha-n} h(\frac{X}{|X|^2})) = \beta\gamma(\gamma + 2 - n)|X|^{\alpha-n+2\gamma}|x|^{-\gamma-2}(|X|^{-2\alpha} y^\alpha + \mu).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} L_\alpha \psi(X) &= \beta\gamma(\gamma + 2 - n)|x|^{-\gamma-2}(y^\alpha + \mu - y^\alpha |X|^{2\gamma-\alpha-n} - |X|^{2\gamma+\alpha-n}\mu) \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

since $\gamma > \max\{\frac{n+\alpha}{2},\ (n-2)\}$ and $\frac{1}{2} < |X| < 1$. Let

$$A(X) = v_{\lambda_0}(X) - \psi(X).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{cases} L_\alpha A(X) \leq 0 & \text{in } \hat{\Omega}, \\ \frac{\partial A(X)}{\partial \nu^\alpha} \geq x_1(w^p_{\lambda_0} - w^p) + \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \nu^\alpha} & \text{on } \hat{\Omega} \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+. \end{cases} \tag{2.8}$$

By choosing suitable small β and μ, we want to show that

$$A(X) \geq 0 \quad \forall X \in \hat{\Omega}. \tag{2.9}$$

Since $v_{\lambda_0} > 0$ in Σ_{λ_0}, we can find some positive constant β_0 such that

$$A(X) \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\hat{\Omega} \cap \{\partial\mathbb{B}_{\frac{1}{2}} \cup \{y = 1/5\}\}$$

for all $0 < \beta < \beta_0$. By the construction of ψ, we know that $\psi(X) = 0$ on $\partial\mathbb{B}_1$. Then $A(X) > 0$ on $\partial\hat{\Omega} \cap \partial\mathbb{B}_1$. If (2.9) is not true, then there exist some $\bar{X} = (\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ such that

$$A(\bar{X}) = \min_{\hat{\Omega}} A(X) < 0.$$

By the maximum principle, it yields that $\bar{X} \in \hat{\Omega} \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$, that is, $\bar{y} = 0$. We have

$$v_{\lambda_0}(\bar{X}) < \beta\mu(|\bar{x}|^{-\gamma} - 1)(|\bar{x}|^{\gamma+\alpha-n} + 1) \tag{2.10}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial y}(\bar{X}) \geq 0, \quad i.e. \quad \frac{\partial A}{\partial \nu^\alpha}(\bar{X}) \leq 0. \tag{2.11}$$

If we calculate $\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \nu^\alpha}$ at $\bar{X}$, it is shown that

$$\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \nu^\alpha}(\bar{X}) = \alpha\beta(|\bar{x}|^{-\gamma} - 1)(1 + |\bar{x}|^{\gamma-\alpha-n}). \tag{2.12}$$

The inequality (2.11) and equality (2.12) together with the second inequality in (2.8) implies that

$$p\bar{x}_1\xi^{p-1}(\bar{X})v_{\lambda_0}(\bar{X}) + \alpha\beta(|\bar{x}|^{-\gamma} - 1)(1 + |\bar{x}|^{\gamma-\alpha-n}) \leq 0,$$

where $\xi(\bar{X})$ is between $w_{\lambda_0}(\bar{X})$ and $w(\bar{X})$.

Thanks to (2.10), it follows that

$$\mu p\bar{x}_1\xi^{p-1}(\bar{X}) + \alpha \leq 0. \tag{2.13}$$

If we choose

$$0 < \mu < \min_{\frac{1}{2}\leq|X|\leq 1} \frac{\alpha}{1 + p|x|\xi^{p-1}(X)}$$

at the beginning, we will arrive at a contradiction from (2.13). Therefore $A(X) \geq 0$ in $\hat{\Omega}$. Note that $A(\hat{X}) = 0$, which implies that

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial x_1}(\hat{X}) \leq 0.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial v_{\lambda_0}(\hat{X})}{\partial x_1} &= \frac{\partial A(\hat{X})}{\partial x_1} + \frac{\psi(\hat{X})}{\partial x_1} \\ &\leq \frac{\psi(\hat{X})}{\partial x_1} = -2\alpha\beta\mu < 0. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

We now continue our argument in Step 2. Let

$$g(X) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} \ln[(2 + \lambda_0 - x_1)^2 + x_i^2] + \ln[(2 + \lambda_0 - x_1)^2 + y^2]$$

and

$$\bar{v}_\lambda(X) = \frac{v_\lambda(X)}{g(X)}.$$

We know that $\bar{v}_\lambda(X)$ satisfies (2.4) in Σ_{λ_0}. For a fixed λ, it is true that $\bar{v}_\lambda(X) \to 0$ as $|x| \to \infty$. From the definition of λ_0 and the maximum principle, there exist sequences of $\lambda_j > \lambda_0$ and $X^j \in \overline{\Sigma}_{\lambda_j} \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$, such that $\lambda_j \to \lambda_0$ as $j \to \infty$ and

$$\bar{v}_{\lambda_j}(X^j) = \inf_{\Sigma_{\lambda_j}} \bar{v}_{\lambda_j}(X) < 0.$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{\partial \bar{v}_{\lambda_j}}{\partial x_1}(X^j) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \bar{v}_{\lambda_j}}{\partial \nu^\alpha}(X^j) \leq 0. \tag{2.14}$$

However, we are able to show that (2.14) contradicts the following lemma. To complete the proof of Proposition 1, we only need to prove the following result.

LEMMA 2. *Let $\lambda_j > \lambda_0$ and $\lambda_j \to \lambda_0$ as $j \to \infty$. If $X^j \in \Sigma_{\lambda_j} \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$ with*

$$\frac{\partial \bar{v}_{\lambda_j}}{\partial x_1}(X^j) = 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \bar{v}_{\lambda_j}(X^j) < 0,$$

then there exists a sufficiently large j_0 such that

$$\frac{\partial \bar{v}_{\lambda_j}}{\partial \nu^\alpha}(X^j) > 0 \quad \forall j > j_0.$$

PROOF. We verify it by contradiction. If it is not true, then there exist sequences $\lambda_j \to \lambda_0$ ($\lambda_j > \lambda_0$), $X^j \in \Sigma_{\lambda_j} \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$ and $\bar{v}_{\lambda_j}(X^j)$ such that

$$\frac{\partial \bar{v}_{\lambda_j}}{\partial x_1}(X^j) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{v}_{\lambda_j}(X^j) < 0, \tag{2.15}$$

but

$$\frac{\partial \bar{v}_{\lambda_j}}{\partial \nu^\alpha}(X^j) \leq 0. \tag{2.16}$$

Let x_1^j be the first component of X^j, and then $x_1^{j,\lambda_j} = 2\lambda_j - x_1^j$. Because of (2.16),

$$x_1^{j,\lambda_j} w^p_{\lambda_j}(X^j) - x_1^j w^p(X^j) \leq 0.$$

Due to the fact that $\lambda_0 \geq 0$, we have $x_1^{j,\lambda_j} \geq 0$. Thus, $x_1^j > 0$. Furthermore, $x_1^j \in (0,\ \lambda_j)$. Note that $X^j \in \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$. We may write $X^j = (x_1^j,\ \tilde{x}^j,\ 0)$, here $\tilde{x}^j = (x_2^j, \cdots, x_n^j)$. If $\tilde{x}^j$ is bounded, there exists X^0 such that there is a subsequence (we do not distinguish the sequence and its subsequence in the whole paper) such that $X^j \to X^0 \in \overline{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0} \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$. Also notice that

$$\frac{\partial \bar{v}_{\lambda_0}}{\partial x_1}(X^0) = \lim_{j\to\infty} \frac{\partial \bar{v}_{\lambda_j}}{\partial x_1}(X^j) = 0.$$

From Lemma 1, we can infer that $X^0 \notin T_{\lambda_0}$ and $\bar{v}_{\lambda_0}(X^0) \leq 0$, which contradicts the fact that

$$\bar{v}_{\lambda_0}(X^0) > 0 \quad \text{in } \ \overline{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0} \backslash T_{\lambda_0}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\tilde{x}^j$ is unbounded, that is, $|\tilde{x}^j| \to \infty$ as $j \to \infty$. Let

$$w^j(X) = w(x_1, \tilde{x}^j + \tilde{x}, y),$$

where $\tilde{x} = (x_2, \cdots, x_n)$. Since w^j is uniformly bounded, by Corollary 2.1 in [**JLX**]), there exists $\tilde{w} \in H^1_{loc}(y^{1-\alpha}, \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+) \cap C^{\beta}_{loc}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+})$ such that

$$\begin{cases} w^j \rightharpoonup \tilde{w} & \text{weakly in } H^1_{loc}(y^{1-\alpha}, \overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+}), \\ w^j \to \tilde{w} & \text{in } C^{0,\,\beta}_{loc}(\overline{R^{n+1}_+}) \end{cases}$$

for $\beta > 0$, and $\tilde{w}$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -L_\alpha \tilde{w} = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ \tilde{w} > 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ \frac{\partial \tilde{w}}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = x_1 \tilde{w} & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+. \end{cases} \tag{2.17}$$

Next we want to show that $\tilde{w} \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$.

Let $\tilde{v}_\lambda = \tilde{w}_\lambda - \tilde{w}$. Then $\tilde{v}_\lambda$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -L_\alpha \tilde{v}_\lambda = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_\lambda}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = x_1^\lambda \tilde{w}_\lambda^p - x_1 \tilde{w}^p & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+. \end{cases} \tag{2.18}$$

By (2.5), we know that $\tilde{v}_{\lambda_0}(X) \geq 0$ in Σ_{λ_0}. From (2.15), it follows that

$$\tilde{v}_{\lambda_j}(x_1^j, 0, 0) \leq 0.$$

Since $x_1^j \in (0,\ \lambda_j)$, then x_1^j will converge to some number in $[0\ \lambda_0]$ as $j \to \infty$. If $x_1^j \to x_1^0 < \lambda_0$, we have $\tilde{v}_{\lambda_0}(x_1^0, 0, 0) = 0$. However,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_{\lambda_0}}{\partial \nu^\alpha}(x_1^0, 0, 0) &= x_1^{0,\lambda_0} \tilde{w}^p_{\lambda_0}(x_1^0, 0, 0) - x_1^0 \tilde{w}^p(x_1^0, 0, 0) \\ &> x_1^0 (\tilde{w}^p_{\lambda_0}(x_1^0, 0, 0) - \tilde{w}^p(x_1^0, 0, 0)) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

which contradicts the Hopf lemma in [**CaS**]. Thus, $x_1^j \to x_1^0 = \lambda_0$ as $j \to \infty$. If $\tilde{w} \not\equiv 0$, then $\tilde{v}_{\lambda_0} > 0$ in Σ_{λ_0}. Since

$$\frac{\partial v_\lambda}{\partial x_1} = g \frac{\partial \bar{v}_\lambda}{\partial x_1} + \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_1} \bar{v}_\lambda,$$

it follows from (2.15) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_{\lambda_0}}{\partial x_1}(x^0, 0, 0) &= \lim_{j \to \infty} \frac{\partial v_{\lambda_j}}{\partial x_1}(X^j) \\ &= \lim_{j \to \infty} \frac{\partial \bar{v}_{\lambda_j}}{\partial x_1}(X^j) g + \lim_{j \to \infty} \bar{v}_{\lambda_j}(X^j) \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_1} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

It contradicts Lemma 1. Therefore, $\tilde{w} \equiv 0$.

It follows that $w^j(0) \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$. Define

$$W^j(X) = \frac{w^j(X)}{w^j(0)}.$$

By the Harnack inequality in [**CaS**], $W^j(X)$ is bounded in $\bar{\mathbb{B}}_R^+$ for every R. Also $W^j(X)$ satisifies

$$\begin{cases} -L_\alpha W^j = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ \frac{\partial W^j}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = x_1 (W^j)^p (w^j(0))^{p-1} & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+. \end{cases} \tag{2.20}$$

By Corollary 2.1 in [**JLX**] again, it follows that

$$\begin{cases} W^j \rightharpoonup W & \text{weakly in } H^1_{loc}(y^{1-\alpha}, \overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+}), \\ W^j \to W & \text{in } C^{0,\,\beta}_{loc}(\overline{R^{n+1}_+}) \end{cases}$$

for some $\beta > 0$ with $W(0) = 1$. Furthermore, $W(X) \geq 0$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -L_\alpha W = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ \frac{\partial W}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+. \end{cases} \tag{2.21}$$

Thanks to the Harnack inequality in [**CaS**] again, that is,

$$\sup_{\mathbb{B}_R^+} W \leq C \inf_{\mathbb{B}_R^+} W,$$

where C is independent of R. Let

$$\bar{W} = W - \inf W.$$

$\bar{W}$ satisfies the same equation as (2.21). Since $\inf \bar{W} = 0$, then exists a sequence of $X_j \in \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$ such that $\lim\limits_{j\to\infty} \bar{W}(X_j) = 0$. Thus, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exist some $\bar{X} \in \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$ such that $\bar{W}(\bar{X}) \leq \epsilon$. By Harnack inequality again,

$$\sup_{\mathbb{B}_R^+(\bar{X})} \bar{W}(X) \leq C\epsilon.$$

Since C is independent of R,

$$\bar{W}(X) \leq C\epsilon \quad \forall X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+.$$

Let $\epsilon \to 0$, then $\bar{W} \equiv$ consant. Hence $W(X) \equiv 1$. By Proposition 2.6 in [**JLX**], it follows that for every R, ϵ and $X \in \mathbb{B}_R^+(x_1^j, 0, 0)$,

$$|\nabla_x W^j(X)| \leq \epsilon, \quad \text{as } j \text{ large enough.}$$

The application of Harnack inequality further implies that

$$|\nabla_x w^j(X)| \leq \epsilon w^j(0) \leq C\epsilon \inf_{\mathbb{B}_R^+(x_1^j,0,0)} w^j(X)$$

for $X \in \mathbb{B}_R^+(x_1^j, 0, 0)$ and large enough j, where $C = C(R, \max(w), \lambda_0)$. Therefore,

$$|\nabla_x w(X)| \leq C\epsilon w(X) \quad \text{for } X = (t, \tilde{x}^j, 0), \tag{2.22}$$

where $t \in (0,\ \lambda_0 + R/2)$ with large R.

For $X = (t, \tilde{x}^j, 0)$ and $t \in (0,\ \lambda_0 + R/2)$, from (2.22),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial(x_1 w^p)}{\partial x_1} &= w^p + p x_1 w^{p-1} \frac{\partial w}{\partial x_1} \\ &= w^{p-1}(w + p x_1 \frac{\partial w}{\partial x_1}) \\ &> 0 \end{aligned}$$

if ϵ is sufficiently small. Then, for j large enough,

$$\frac{\partial \bar{v}_{\lambda_j}}{\partial \nu^\alpha}(X^j) = \frac{1}{g} \cdot (x_1^{j,\lambda_j} w^p_{\lambda_j}(X^j) - x_1^j w^p(X^j)) > 0$$

which contradicts (2.16). We finally arrive at the conclusion of Lemma 2. This completes the proof of Proposition 1.

□

With the help of Proposition 1, we are able to give the proof of Theorem 1. We need to construct some new type of auxiliary function. Unlike the semilinear Laplacian equation, the construction of auxiliary functions for fractional Laplacian is more involved. Our auxiliary function is base on the product of the first eigenfunction of Laplacian equation and some Bessel function.

Proof of Theorem 1. We first introduce some test functions. ψ solves the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'' + \frac{1-\alpha}{s}\psi' &= \psi, \\ \psi(0) &= 1, \\ \lim_{s\to\infty} \psi(s) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

In fact ψ minimizes the following function

$$H_\alpha(\psi) := \int_0^\infty (|\psi(s)|^2 + |\psi'(s)|^2) s^{1-\alpha}\, ds.$$

It is known that ψ is a combination of Bessel function [**L**] or [**BCDS**] and it satisfies the following asymptotic behavior

$$\psi(s) \sim \begin{cases} 1 - c_1(\alpha) s^\alpha & \text{for } s \to 0, \\ \\ c_2(\alpha) s^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}} e^{-s} & \text{for } s \to \infty, \end{cases}$$

where

$$c_1(\alpha) = \frac{2^{1-\alpha}\Gamma(1-\frac{1}{2}\alpha)}{\alpha\Gamma(\frac{1}{2}\alpha)} \quad \text{and} \quad c_2(\alpha) = \frac{2^{\frac{1-\alpha/2}{2}}\pi^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2}\alpha)}.$$

Moreover,

$$-\lim_{s\to 0^+} s^{1-\alpha}\psi'(s) = k_\alpha.$$

Recall that $k_\alpha = \alpha c_1(\alpha)$. Since $\lim_{s\to 0^+} s^{1-\alpha}\psi'(s) < 0$, there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that $\psi'(s) < 0$ in $(0,\ \delta)$. Let

$$\phi_*(X) := \phi(x)(\psi(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} y) - \psi(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\delta) > 0$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}_R := \{(x,y) | (x_1 - R)^2 + |\tilde{x}|^2 < 1 \ \text{ and } \ 0 < y < \delta\}$$

be the cylindrical domain. Here $\phi(x)$ is the first eigenfunction of the following eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} -\triangle\phi = & \lambda\phi & \text{in } \{x|(x_1-R)^2+|\tilde{x}|^2<1\}, \\ \phi > & 0 & \text{in } \{x|(x_1-R)^2+|\tilde{x}|^2<1\}, \\ \phi = & 0 & \text{on } \{x|(x_1-R)^2+|\tilde{x}|^2=1\}. \end{cases} \tag{2.24}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{cases} -L_\alpha\phi_* + \frac{\lambda\phi_*\psi(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\delta)}{\psi(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}y)-\psi(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\delta)} = & 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{C}_R, \\ \phi_* = & 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{C}_R\backslash\{y=0\}, \\ \frac{\partial\phi_*}{\partial\nu^\alpha} = & \frac{k_\alpha\lambda_1^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\phi_*}{1-\psi(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\delta)} & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{C}_R\cap\{y=0\}. \end{cases} \tag{2.25}$$

Since w is nondecreasing in x_1 direction, from Proposition 1, we obtain that

$$x_1 w^{p-1}(X) \geq (R-1)m_0^{p-1}$$

for $R>2$ and $X\in\mathcal{C}_R$, where

$$m_0 = \min_{X\in\mathcal{C}_1} w(X) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}_1 = \{(x,y)|(x_1-1)^2+|\tilde{x}|^2<1 \ \text{ and } \ 0<y<\delta\}.$$

We can also see that $w(X)$ satisfies the following

$$\begin{cases} -L_\alpha w = & 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{C}_R, \\ w > & 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{C}_R\backslash\{y=0\}, \\ \frac{\partial w}{\partial\nu^\alpha} \geq & (R-1)m_0^{p-1}w & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{C}_R\cap\{y=0\}. \end{cases} \tag{2.26}$$

Set

$$\psi_* := \phi_*/w > 0.$$

Then $\psi_*(X)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} L_\alpha\psi_* + 2\nabla\psi_*\cdot\frac{\nabla w}{w} - \frac{\lambda\psi_*\psi(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\delta)}{\psi(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}y)-\psi(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\delta)} = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{C}_R, \\ \psi_* = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{C}_R\backslash\{y=0\}, \\ \frac{\partial\psi_*}{\partial\nu^\alpha} = (\frac{k_\alpha\lambda_1^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{1-\psi(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\delta)} - (R-1)m_0^{p-1})\psi_* & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{C}_R\cap\{y=0\}. \end{cases} \tag{2.27}$$

If we choose R sufficiently large, then

$$(\frac{k_\alpha\lambda_1^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{1-\psi(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\delta)} - (R-1)m_0^{p-1}) \leq -C_0$$

for some $C_0>0$. Thus

$$\frac{\partial\psi_*}{\partial\nu^\alpha} \leq -C_0\psi_*. \tag{2.28}$$

By maximum principle, the maximum value value of ψ_* should be attained at some point on $\partial\mathcal{C}_R\cap\{y=0\}$. Then $\frac{\partial\psi_*}{\partial\nu^\alpha}\geq 0$ at that point. Obviously, it is a contradiction with (2.28). Hence $\psi_*\equiv 0$ in $\mathcal{C}_R$. Then $\phi_*\equiv 0$, which contradicts the construction of ϕ_*. Therefore $w\equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$. We complete the proof of Theorem 1.

□

3. A priori estimates

We apply the blow-up argument in [**GS**] to obtain the a priori estimates. It reduces the a priori bound to the results of Liouville theorems. We first recall two classical Liouville theorems for fractional Laplacian in [**BCDS**].

LEMMA 3. *Let $1 \leq \alpha < 2$ and $1 < p < \frac{n+\alpha}{n-\alpha}$. Then the problem*

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla w) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ w > 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = w^p & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

has no bounded solution.

Let

$$\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_{++} := \{X = (x', x_n, y) | x_n > 0,\ y > 0\}.$$

LEMMA 4. *Let $1 \leq \alpha < 2$ and $1 < p < \frac{n+\alpha}{n-\alpha}$. Then the problem*

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla w) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_{++}, \\ \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = w^p(x',\ x_n, 0) & \text{on } \{X | y = 0\}, \\ w(x', 0, y) = 0 & \text{on } \{X | x_n = 0\} \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

has no positive bounded solution.

Our Liouville theorem (i.e. Theorem 1) is also essential in performing the blow-up argument for (1.1). In order to get the a priori bound for (1.1), we shall consider Caffarelli-Silvestre's extension, that is,

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla w) = 0 & \text{in } C_\Omega, \\ w(x, y) = 0 & \text{on } \partial_L C_\Omega, \\ \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = a(x)g(w) & \text{on } \Omega \times \{0\}. \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

Here $w(x, 0) = u$ on Ω, If one obtains the a priori bound for (3.3), then one proves Theorem 2. We shall prove the following proposition. The proof is an adaption of the argument in [**GS**] and [**BCN**].

PROPOSITION 2. *Assume that $1 \leq \alpha < 2$ and $1 < p < \frac{n+\alpha}{n-\alpha}$. Then there exists a generic constant C such that every solution of (3.3) satisfies*

$$\|w\|_\infty \leq C.$$

PROOF. We prove it by contradiction. Suppose the conclusion in the proposition is false. Then there exists a sequence of $\{w_j\}$ such that

$$M_j = \|w_j\|_\infty \to \infty, \quad \text{as } j \to \infty.$$

By the maximum principle, there exists $(x^j, 0)$ such that $M_j = w_j(x^j, 0)$. Let

$$z = \frac{x - x^j}{\lambda_j}.$$

The positive scale factor λ_j will be determined later with $\lambda_j \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$. We introduce the rescaled function

$$V_j(z,\, y) := \frac{w_j(x^j + \lambda_j z, \lambda_j y)}{M_j}.$$

Let

$$\Omega_j = \frac{1}{\lambda_j}(\Omega - x^j).$$

We can easily see that

$$\max V_j = V_j(0) = 1.$$

A direct calculation shows that V_j satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla V_j) = 0 & \text{in } C_{\Omega_j}, \\ V_j = 0 & \text{on } \partial_L C_{\Omega_j}, \\ \frac{\partial V_j}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = M_j^{-1}\lambda_j^\alpha a(x^j + \lambda_j z) g(M_j V_j) & \text{on } \Omega_j \times \{0\}. \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

Since x^j is bounded in Ω, then $x^j \to x^0 \in \bar{\Omega}$ as $j \to \infty$. There are several cases for the location of the limit point x^0. Namely,

Case 1: $x^0 \in \Omega^+ \cap \Omega^-$.

Case 2: $x^0 \in \partial\Omega$.

Case 3: $x^0 \in \Gamma$.

If Case 1 occurs, set

$$\lambda_j = M_j^{\frac{1-p}{\alpha}}.$$

Let $d_j = dist\{x^j,\ \partial\Omega\}$. Since $x^0 \in \Omega$, then $d_j/\lambda_j \to \infty$ as $j \to \infty$. The fact that $\mathbb{B}_{d_j/\lambda_j} \subset \Omega_j$ implies that $\Omega_j \to \mathbb{R}^n$ as $j \to \infty$. By regularity estimates as in the proof of Theorem 1, we have

$$\begin{cases} V_j \rightharpoonup V & \text{weakly in } H^1_{loc}(y^{1-\alpha}, \overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+}), \\ V_j \to V & \text{in } C^{0,\,\beta}_{loc}(\overline{R^{n+1}_+}) \end{cases}$$

for some $\beta > 0$ and the equation (3.4) will turn into be a limit equation

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla V) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ V \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ \frac{\partial V}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = a(x^0)V^p & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+. \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

In above, we have used the assumption (1.2). The maximum principle implies that $a(x^0) > 0$. We also have $V(0) = 1$. However, $V \equiv 0$ from Lemma 3. A contradiction is arrived.

If Case 2 occurs, then $d_j \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$. We choose the same λ_j as case 1. We have two subcases for the ratio of d_j/λ_j, that is,

Case (a): $d_j/\lambda_j \to \delta_0 \geq 0$ for a subsequence.

Case (b): $d_j/\lambda_j \to \infty$ for a subsequence.

In case (a), after a limit procedure, the domain Ω_j converges to (up to a rotation) some half space $H_{\delta_0} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | x_n \geq -\delta_0\}$. We obtain that V is a nonnegative solution

of

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla V) = 0 & \text{in } H_{\delta_0}\times(0,\ \infty), \\ V = 0 & \text{on } \partial H_{\delta_0}\times(0,\ \infty), \\ \frac{\partial V}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = a(x^0)V^p & \text{on } H_{\delta_0}\times\{0\} \end{cases} \tag{3.6}$$

where $V(0)=1$. We can also see that $a(x^0)>0$. By a translation, we can infer that $V\equiv 0$ from Lemma 4. Clearly, it is a contradiction. In case (b), if we carry out the same procedure as case 1, we will also arrive at a contradiction. We only need to take care of Case 3.

If case 3 occurs, set

$$\delta_j := dist(x^j,\ \Gamma) = |x^j - z^j|, \quad z^j\in\Gamma.$$

Then $\delta_j\to 0$ as $j\to\infty$. Since $\nabla a\neq 0$ on Γ, it follows that δ_j is given by

$$\delta_j = \begin{cases} \frac{\nabla a(z^j)}{|\nabla a(z^j)|}(x^j - z^j), & x^j\in\Omega^+, \\ \\ -\frac{\nabla a(z^j)}{|\nabla a(z^j)|}(x^j - z^j), & x^j\in\Omega^-. \end{cases}$$

Since $a(z^j)=0$ and $a(x)\in C^2(\bar\Omega)$, by Taylor expansion, we have

$$a(x^j+\lambda_j z) = \pm|\nabla a(z^j)|\delta_j + \lambda_j\nabla a(z^j)\cdot z + O(\lambda_j^2|z|^2+\delta_j^2).$$

Substituting this identity into (3.4) yields that

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla V_j) = 0 & \text{in } C_{\Omega_j}, \\ V_j = 0 & \text{on } \partial_L C_{\Omega_j}, \\ \frac{\partial V_j}{\partial\nu^\alpha} = M_j^{p-1}\lambda_j^\alpha(\pm|\nabla a(z^j)|\delta_j + \lambda_j\nabla a(z^j)\cdot z + O(\lambda_j^2|z|^2+\delta_j^2))g(M_jV_j)/M_j^p & \text{on } \Omega_j\times\{0\}. \end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

Observe that the third equation of (3.7) on $\Omega_j\times\{0\}$ holds in the ball

$$|z|\le\frac{1}{3\lambda_j}dist(x^0,\ \partial\Omega)$$

for large j. There are several subcases to consider.

Case a: $\delta_j/M_j^{\frac{1-p}{1+\alpha}}\to 0$ for a subsequence.

We choose $\lambda_j = M_j^{\frac{1-p}{1+\alpha}}$. Note that Ω_j tends to $\mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\delta_j\lambda_j^\alpha M_j^{p-1}\to 0$$

and

$$O(\lambda_j^2|z|^2+\delta_j^2)\lambda_j^\alpha M_j^{p-1}\to 0$$

for fixed z as $j\to\infty$. By regularity estimates, $V_j\to V$ in $C^{0,\ \beta}_{loc}(\overline{R^{n+1}_+})$ and V satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla V) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ V\ge 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ \frac{\partial V}{\partial\nu^\alpha} = \nabla a(x^0)\cdot zV^p & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ \end{cases} \tag{3.8}$$

with $V(0)=1$. After a suitable rotation and rescaling, it becomes

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla V) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ V \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ \frac{\partial V}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = z_1 V^p & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+. \end{cases} \tag{3.9}$$

Furthermore, $V(0)=1$. However, we know that the solution for (3.9) is trivial from Theorem 1. A contradiction is arrived.

Case b: $\delta_j/M_j^{\frac{1-p}{1+\alpha}} \to \infty$ for a subsequence.

We select $\lambda_j = \delta_j^{\frac{-1}{\alpha}} M_j^{\frac{1-p}{\alpha}}$. Then

$$\lambda_j^{1+\alpha} M_j^{p-1} = \delta_j^{\frac{-(1+\alpha)}{\alpha}} M_j^{\frac{1-p}{\alpha}} \to 0$$

and

$$O(\lambda_j^2|z|^2 + \delta_j^2)\lambda_j^\alpha M_j^{p-1} \to 0$$

for fixed z as $j \to \infty$. By regularity estimates, $V_j \to V$ and V satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla V) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ V \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ \frac{\partial V}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = \pm|\nabla a(x^0)| V^p & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+. \end{cases} \tag{3.10}$$

Performing a rescaling, we know there exists only trivial solution, which contradicts the fact the $V(0)=1$.

Case c: There exists some constant $\tilde{\delta}$ such that $\delta_j/M_j^{\frac{1-p}{1+\alpha}} \to \tilde{\delta}$ for a subsequence.

Let again $\lambda_j = M_j^{\frac{1-p}{1+\alpha}}$. Then we have

$$O(\lambda_j^2|z|^2 + \delta_j^2)\lambda_j^\alpha M_j^{p-1} \to 0$$

for fixed z as $j \to \infty$. By elliptic estimates, $V_j \to V$ and V is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla V) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ V \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ \frac{\partial V}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = (\pm|\nabla a(x^0)|\tilde{\delta} + a(x^0)\cdot y)V^p & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+. \end{cases} \tag{3.11}$$

After a suitable rescaling, rotation and translation, it again becomes

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla V) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ V \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ \frac{\partial V}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = z_1 V^p & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ \end{cases} \tag{3.12}$$

with $V(0)=1$. Clearly it is a contradiction from Theorem 1 again. In conclusion, we obtain the a priori bound of solutions.

□

4. Proof of Theorem 3

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 3. We first consider the nonexistence of solutions in the supercritical case, i.e. $p > \frac{n+\alpha}{n-\alpha}$. For the subcritical and critical cases, i.e. $1 < p \leq \frac{n+\alpha}{n-\alpha}$, we consider the solutions in a suitable higher dimension and reduce it to the supercritical case. The idea is inspired by the work of [**LZ**].

Proof of Theorem 3. The proof of the theorem is divided in two cases. We shall show the nonexistence of solutions in both cases.

Case 1 (Supcritical case) : $p > \frac{n+\alpha}{n-\alpha}$.

Since no decay for the solution $w(X)$ is imposed at infinity, we introduce the Kelvin transform, that is,

$$\tilde{w}(X) = \frac{1}{|X|^{n-\alpha}} w(\frac{X}{|X|^2}).$$

Then $\tilde{w}$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla \tilde{w}) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ \frac{\partial \tilde{w}}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = -|X|^{\tilde{\beta}} \tilde{w}^p(x,0) & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ \backslash \{0\}, \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

where $\tilde{\beta} = p(n-\alpha) - (n+\alpha)$.

Because of the Kelvin transform, the origin is the singular point. We first prove a technical lemma to take care of the origin.

Lemma 5. *Assume that $\tilde{w}(X)$ satisfies (4.1). For all $0 < \epsilon < \min\{1, \frac{2\alpha}{\alpha+1} \min_{\partial\mathbb{B}^+_1 \cap \partial\mathbb{B}_1} \tilde{w}\}$, we have $\tilde{w}(X) \geq \epsilon/2$ for every $X \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}^+_1 \backslash \{0\}$.*

Proof. For $0 < r < 1$, we introduce the following test function

$$\psi_1(X) = \frac{\epsilon}{2} - \frac{\alpha+1}{2\alpha} \frac{r^{n-\alpha}\epsilon}{|X|^{n-\alpha}} + \frac{\epsilon y^\alpha}{2\alpha} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{B}^+_1 \backslash \mathbb{B}^+_r.$$

Set

$$A_1(X) := \tilde{w}(X) - \psi_1(X).$$

Direct calculation shows that

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla A_1) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{B}^+_1 \backslash \mathbb{B}^+_r, \\ \frac{\partial \tilde{w}}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = -|X|^{\tilde{\beta}} w^p(x,0) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} & \text{on } \partial(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^+_1 \backslash \bar{\mathbb{B}}^+_r) \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+. \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

We claim that

$$A_1(X) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \bar{\mathbb{B}}^+_1 \backslash \bar{\mathbb{B}}^+_r. \tag{4.3}$$

We show this claim by contradiction. On $\partial\mathbb{B}^+_r \cap \partial\mathbb{B}_r$, we have

$$A_1(X) = \tilde{w} - (\frac{\epsilon}{2} - \frac{(\alpha+1)\epsilon}{2\alpha} + \frac{\epsilon y^\alpha}{2\alpha}) > \tilde{w} > 0.$$

On $\partial\mathbb{B}^+_1 \cap \partial\mathbb{B}_1$, it follows that

$$A_1(X) = \tilde{w} - (\frac{\epsilon}{2} - \frac{(\alpha+1)\epsilon}{2\alpha} r^{n-\alpha} + \frac{\epsilon y^\alpha}{2\alpha}) > \tilde{w} - \frac{(\alpha+1)\epsilon}{2\alpha} > 0.$$

If (4.3) is not true, by maximum principle, there exists some $\bar{X} = (\bar{x}, 0) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$ with $r < |\bar{x}| < 1$ such that

$$A_1(\bar{X}) = \min_{\bar{\mathbb{B}}^+_1 \setminus \bar{\mathbb{B}}^+_r} A_1(X) < 0.$$

On one hand,

$$\frac{\partial A_1}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = -\lim_{y\to 0} y^{1-\alpha}\frac{\partial A_1}{\partial y} = -|\bar{X}|^{\tilde{\beta}}\tilde{w}^p(\bar{X}) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \le 0.$$

Thus

$$\tilde{w}^p(\bar{X}) \ge \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

since $\tilde{\beta} > 0$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(\bar{X}) &= \tilde{w}(\bar{X}) - (\tfrac{\epsilon}{2} - \tfrac{(\alpha+1)\epsilon}{2\alpha}\tfrac{r^{n-\alpha}}{|X|^{n-\alpha}}) \\ &> \tilde{w}(\bar{X}) - \tfrac{\epsilon}{2} \\ &\ge 0. \end{aligned}$$

It contradicts that $A_1(\bar{X}) < 0$. Hence we verify the claim. For $X \in \mathbb{B}_1\setminus\{0\}$, it follows that $A_1(X) \ge 0$ for $0 < r < |X|$. Let $r \to 0$, we have that $\tilde{w} \ge \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. □

For $\lambda < 0$, let

$$\Sigma_\lambda = \{X | x_1 \le \lambda\}$$

and

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda = \Sigma_\lambda \setminus \{0^\lambda\}.$$

Here 0^λ is the reflection point of 0 with respect to the plane T_λ. Let

$$\tilde{v}_\lambda(X) = \tilde{w}_\lambda(X) - \tilde{w}(X).$$

Then $\tilde{v}_\lambda$ satisfies

$$\text{(4.4)} \qquad \begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla\tilde{v}_\lambda) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ \frac{\partial\tilde{v}}{\partial\nu^\alpha} \ge -p|X_\lambda|^{\tilde{\beta}}\xi^{p-1}(X)\tilde{v}_\lambda(x,0) & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+\setminus\{0\}, \end{cases}$$

where ξ is a positive function between $\tilde{w}_\lambda$ and $\tilde{w}$. We apply the moving plane method for solutions of equation (4.4). Our goal is to show that $\tilde{w}$ is symmetric with respect to $x_1 = 0$. The proof consists of two steps.

Step 1: If λ is sufficiently negative, then $\tilde{v}_\lambda \ge 0$ for all $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$.

Suppose it fails, then $\tilde{v}_\lambda < 0$ somewhere in $\tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$. Since $\tilde{w}_\lambda$ and $\tilde{w}$ both converge to 0 as $|X| \to \infty$, then $\tilde{v}_\lambda(X) \to 0$ as $|X| \to \infty$. it follows from Lemma 5 that if λ is sufficiently negative, $\tilde{v}_\lambda(X) > 0$ for X close to 0^λ, Thus there exists some point $\bar{X}$ such that

$$\tilde{v}_\lambda(\bar{X}) = \min_{X\in\tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda} \tilde{v}_\lambda(X) < 0.$$

From the maximum principle, we know that $\bar{X} \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$. Furthermore, $\frac{\partial\tilde{v}_\lambda}{\partial\nu^\alpha} < 0$, but it contradicts the second equation in (4.4). Thus the plane can be moved to the right from the negative infinity. We assume that the plane will reach a critical point. Define

$$\lambda_0 = \sup\{\lambda < 0 | \tilde{w}_\mu \ge 0 \text{ in } \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda \text{ for all } \quad -\infty < \mu < \lambda\}.$$

Step 2: We show that $\lambda_0 = 0$.

If it is not true, it follows that $\lambda_0 < 0$. We claim that

$$\tilde{v}_{\lambda_0}(X) \equiv 0, \tag{4.5}$$

which contradicts

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{v}_\lambda}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = -|X_\lambda|^{\tilde{\beta}} \tilde{w}^p_\lambda(X) + |X|^{\tilde{\beta}} w^p(X) \quad \text{for } X \in \partial \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+.$$

We also show it by contradiction. By the maximum principle, $\tilde{v}_{\lambda_0}(X) > 0$ in $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0} \backslash T_{\lambda_0}$. we need the following lemma to take care of the singular point.

LEMMA 6. *For $r_0 < \min\{\frac{1}{2}\lambda_0,\ 1\}$, there exists some positive constant c such that $\tilde{v}_{\lambda_0}(X) > c$ in $\mathbb{B}^+_{r_0}(0^{\lambda_0}) \backslash \{0^{\lambda_0}\}$.*

PROOF. Since $\tilde{v}_{\lambda_0} > 0$ in $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0} \cap \mathbb{B}^+_{r_0}(0^{\lambda_0})$, then $\min_{\partial \mathbb{B}^+_{r_0}(0^{\lambda_0})} \tilde{v}_{\lambda_0} \geq \epsilon$ for some $0 < \epsilon < 1$. By the continuity of $\tilde{w}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ \backslash \{0\}$, there exists some positive constant c_1 such that

$$\tilde{w}(X) < c_1 \quad \text{for } X \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}^+_{r_0}(0^{\lambda_0}). \tag{4.6}$$

Let

$$\psi_2(X) = \frac{\epsilon\mu}{2} - \frac{r^{n-\alpha}\epsilon}{|X|^{n-\alpha}} + \frac{\epsilon(1-\mu)y^\alpha}{2} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{B}^+_{r_0}(0^{\lambda_0}) \backslash \mathbb{B}^+_r(0^{\lambda_0}),$$

where the positive constant μ will be determined later. Set

$$A_2(X) = \tilde{v}_{\lambda_0}(X) - \psi_2(X).$$

Direct calculation shows that

(4.7)
$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla A_2) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{B}^+_{r_0}(0^{\lambda_0}) \backslash \mathbb{B}^+_r(0^{\lambda_0}), \\ \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial \nu^\alpha} = -|X^{\lambda_0}|^{\tilde{\beta}} \tilde{w}^p_{\lambda_0}(x,0) + |X|^{\tilde{\beta}} \tilde{w}^p(x,0) + \frac{\epsilon(1-\mu)}{2} & \text{on } \partial(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^+_{r_0}(0^{\lambda_0}) \backslash \bar{\mathbb{B}}^+_r(0^{\lambda_0})) \cap \partial \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+. \end{cases}$$

We also claim that

$$A_2(X) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{B}^+_{r_0}(0^{\lambda_0}) \backslash \mathbb{B}^+_r(0^{\lambda_0}).$$

On $\partial \mathbb{B}^+_{r_0}(0^{\lambda_0}) \cap \partial \mathbb{B}_{r_0}(0^{\lambda_0})$,

$$A_2(X) \geq \epsilon - (\frac{\epsilon\mu}{2} - \frac{r^{n-\alpha}\epsilon}{|r_0|^{n-\alpha}} + \frac{\epsilon(1-\mu)}{2}) > 0.$$

On $\partial \mathbb{B}^+_r(0^{\lambda_0}) \cap \partial \mathbb{B}_r(0^{\lambda_0})$,

$$A_2(X) > \tilde{w}_{\lambda_0}(X) > 0.$$

By the maximum principle, the minimum value of $A_2(X)$ shall occur on $\partial(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^+_{r_0}(0^{\lambda_0}) \backslash \bar{\mathbb{B}}^+_r(0^{\lambda_0})) \cap \partial \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$. So there exists some $\bar{X} \in \partial(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^+_{r_0}(0^{\lambda_0}) \backslash \bar{\mathbb{B}}^+_r(0^{\lambda_0})) \cap \partial \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$ such that

$$A_2(\bar{X}) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial \nu^\alpha}(\bar{X}) \leq 0.$$

The fact that $A_2(\bar{X}) < 0$ implies that

$$\tilde{w}_{\lambda_0}(\bar{X}) - \tilde{w}(\bar{X}) - \psi_2(\bar{X}) < 0.$$

Then

$$\tilde{w}_{\lambda_0}(\bar{X}) \leq c_2, \tag{4.8}$$

where c_2 only depends on c_1. Furthermore, $A_2(\bar{X}) < 0$ implies that

$$\tilde{v}_{\lambda_0}(\bar{X}) \leq \frac{\epsilon\mu}{2} - \frac{r^{n-\alpha}\epsilon}{|\bar{X}|^{n-\alpha}} < \frac{\epsilon\mu}{2}. \tag{4.9}$$

With the help of (4.6),(4.8) and Mean value theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{X}^{\lambda_0}|^{\tilde{\beta}}\tilde{w}^p_{\lambda_0}(\bar{x},0) - |\bar{X}|^{\tilde{\beta}}\tilde{w}^p(\bar{x},0) &\leq |\bar{X}^{\lambda_0}|^{\tilde{\beta}}(\tilde{w}^p_{\lambda_0}(\bar{X}) - \tilde{w}^p(\bar{X})) \\ &\leq c_3\tilde{v}_{\lambda_0}(\bar{X}) \end{aligned}$$

where c_3 depends on λ_0, c_1 and c_2. Since $\frac{\partial A_2}{\partial \nu^\alpha} \leq 0$, by the second equation of (4.7), we infer that

$$\frac{\epsilon(1-\mu)}{2c_3} \leq \tilde{v}_{\lambda_0}(\bar{X}). \tag{4.10}$$

Together with (4.9) and (4.10), we have

$$\frac{\epsilon(1-\mu)}{2c_3} < \frac{\epsilon\mu}{2}.$$

If we choose μ small enough such that $\mu < 1/(1+c_3)$ at the beginning, we will reach a contradiction. Hence we prove the claim. Let $r \to 0$. Hence

$$\tilde{v}_{\lambda_0}(X) > c = \frac{\epsilon\mu}{2}$$

for $\mu < 1/(1+c_3)$. This completes the proof. □

We continue the proof of Step 2. By the definition of λ_0, there exist sequences of $\lambda_k (\lambda_k > \lambda_0)$ and $\bar{X}_k$ such that $\lambda_k \to \lambda_0$ and $\tilde{v}_{\lambda_k}(\bar{X}_k) = \inf_{\tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_k}} \tilde{v}_{\lambda_k}(X) < 0$. By Lemma 6 and continuity of $\tilde{v}_{\lambda_k}$, we have

$$\tilde{v}_{\lambda_k}(X) > \frac{c}{2} \quad \forall X \in \mathbb{B}^+_{r_0}(0^{\lambda_0})\backslash\{0^{\lambda_0}\}$$

for k large enough, since $\tilde{v}_{\lambda_k}(X) \to 0$ as $|X| \to \infty$. By the maximum principle, $\bar{X}_k \in (\tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_k}\backslash\mathbb{B}^+_{r_0}(0^{\lambda_0})) \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$. The same argument as Step 1 gives the contradiction. Therefore, it is confirmed that $\lambda_0 = 0$.

It is clear that $w(x,y)$ is symmetric with respect to $x_1 = 0$. Since the equation is invariant under rotation, we conclude that $w(x,y)$ is radially symmetric with respect to the point $(0,y)$ for every fixed y. Thanks to the Kelvin transform, we can choose the origin arbitrarily on the plane $y = 0$. Thus, $w(x,y)$ only depends on the variable y. The degenerate partial differential equation (1.9) turns out to be ordinary differential equation, that is,

$$\begin{cases} w_{yy} + \frac{1-\alpha}{y}w_y &= 0 \quad \forall\ y > 0, \\ -\lim\limits_{y\to 0^+} y^{1-\alpha}w_y &= w^p(0). \end{cases}$$

Solving the ordinary differential equation gives that

$$w = \frac{a}{\alpha}y^\alpha + b$$

where $b > 0$ and $a = b^p$.

Case 2 (Subcritical and critical cases) : $1 < p \leq \frac{n+\alpha}{n-\alpha}$.

We expand the dimension of the space and reduce the problem into supercritical case. We choose a large integer m such that

$$p > \frac{n+m+\alpha}{n+m-\alpha}.$$

Let

$$w^0(x_1, \cdots, x_n, x_{n+1}, \cdots, x_{n+m}, y) = w(x_1, \cdots, x_n, y).$$

Then w^0 satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -div(y^{1-\alpha}\nabla w^0) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}_+, \\ \lim\limits_{y\to 0^+} y^{1-\alpha}\frac{\partial w^0}{\partial y}(x,y) = (w^0)^p & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}_+. \end{cases} \tag{4.11}$$

Observe that p is supercritical in the equation (4.11). Applying the same argument as Case 1, we deduce that w^0 is independent of x_i for $i = 1, \cdots, n+m$. Thus, w is independent of $x_1, \cdots, x_n$. Again w only depends on y. Therefore, w satisfies the same conclusion as Case 1. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

□

References

[AT] S. Alama and G. Tarantello, On semilinear elliptic equations with indefinite nonlinearities, Calc. Var., 1 (1993), 439- 475.

[AL] H. Amann and J. Lopez-Gomez, A priori bounds and multiple solutions for superlinear indefinite elliptic problems, J. Diff. Eqns., 146 (1998), 336-374.

[BCDS] C. Brändle, E. Colorado, A. de Pablo and U. Sánchez, A concave-convex elliptic problem involving the fractional Laplacian. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A 143 (2013), no. 1, 39-71.

[BCN] H. Berestycki, I. Capuzzo-Dolcetta, and L. Nirenberg, Supperlinear indefinite elliptic problems and nonlinear Liouville theorems, Topol. Methods Nonl. Anal., 4 (1994), 59-78.

[BCN1] H. Berestycki, I. Capuzzo-Dolcetta, and L. Nirenberg, Variational methods for indifinite superlinear homogeneuous elliptic problems, Nonlinear Diff. Eqns. Appl., 2 (1995), 553-572.

[CG] S.Y. Chang and M. González, Fractional Laplacian in conformal geometry, Adv. Math. 226 (2011), no. 2, 1410-1432.

[CaS] X. Cabré and Y. Sire, Nonlinear equations for fractional Laplacians, I. Regularity, maximum principles and Hamiltonian estimates. Ann. I. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 31(2014), 23-53.

[CS] L. A. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre, An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian, Commun. PDEs 32 (2007), 1245-1260.

[CT] X. Cabré and J. Tan, Positive solutions of nonlinear problems involving the square root of the Laplacian, Adv. Math. 224 (2010), no. 5, 2052-2093.

[CL] W. Chen and C. Li, A priori estimates for prescribing scalar curvature equations, Ann. of Math., 145 (1997), 549-564.

[CL1] W. Chen and C. Li, Moving planes, moving spheres, and apriori estimates, J. Diff. Eqns., 195 (2003), 1-13.

[DL] Y. Du and S. Li, Nonlinear Liouville theorems and a priori estimates for indefinite superlinear elliptic equations, Adv. Differential Equations 10 (2005), no. 8, 841-860.

[GS] B. Gidas and J. Spruck, A priori bounds for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations, Comm. Partial Diff. Eqns., 8 (1981), 883-901.

[JLX] T. Jin, Y.Y. Li and J.Xiong, On a fractional Nirenberg problem, part I: blow up analysis and compactness of solutions, to appear in J. Eur. Math. Soc.

[L] N. N. Lebedev. Special functions and their applications (New York: Dover, 1972).

[Lin] C.S. Lin, On Liouville theorem and apriori estimates for the scalar curvature equations, Ann. Scula Norm. Sup. Pisa CI.Sci., 27 (1998), 107-130.

[LZ] Y. Lou and M. Zhu, Classifications of nonnegative solutions to some elliptic problems, Differential Integral Equations 12 (1999), no. 4, 601-612.

[LYZ] Y.Y. Li and M. Zhu, Uniqueness theorems through the method of moving spheres, Duke Math. J. 80 (1995), no. 2, 383-417.

[Z] M. Zhu, Liouville theorems on some indefinite equations, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh, 129A (1999), 649-661.

[Z1] M. Zhu, On elliptic problems with indefinite superlinear boundary conditions, J. Differential Equations 193 (2003), no. 1, 180-195.

Wenxiong Chen, Department of Mathematics, Yeshiva University, New York, NY 10033, USA, Emails: wchen@yu.edu

Jiuyi Zhu, Department of Mathematics, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA, Emails: jzhu43@math.jhu.edu